

The Role of the Superintendent And School Board in Collective Bargaining: 1989-2010

William L. Sharp
Ball State University

Introduction

School superintendents have many roles, and being responsible for collective bargaining is one of those roles in states where collective bargaining is mandatory. This role has changed over the years, and it varies from school district to school district. And, as teacher associations and unions have increased in number and strength, superintendents and boards of education have had to devote more time to the process of negotiations.

The researcher and the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) conducted a national study in 1989, asking school superintendents their opinions on the topic of collective bargaining: the role of the superintendent, the composition of the board's bargaining team, the choice of the chief spokesperson for the board, the advantages and disadvantages of having board members negotiate, and the frequency of teacher strikes. This study, with a few questions added on "win-win" bargaining, was repeated in 1999. The 1999 study was repeated again in 2010 to see if there were any major shifts in the responses over the years.

The role of the superintendent in negotiations has been debated from the beginning of school negotiations to the present time. The superintendents' national organization itself (AASA) suggested in 1961 that the role should be "an independent third party" (AASA, 1961), and in 1968, the organization said that the superintendent should be a "consultant for both groups" (AASA, 1968). Others have suggested that the superintendent serve in a "transactional"

role and not identify with either the board or the teachers (Getzels, 1968), or have suggested that the superintendent “provide information..., help clarify issues, and otherwise stimulate both groups...” (NEA, 1963).

Some writers have stated that having the superintendent negotiate for the board makes the superintendent “an adversary of the professional staff,” reducing his/her effectiveness in areas such as curriculum leadership (Stinnett, 1966). Campbell and Cunningham stated specifically that “in most cases, the superintendent can become the spokesman for neither group” (Campbell & Cunningham, 1965). Others also agree that putting the superintendent at the negotiations table places him/her in an adversarial setting, making the superintendent the “bad guy” (Ficklen, 1985 and Gaswirth, 1986).

On the other hand, a few suggested that the superintendent should negotiate for the board in order to prevent loss of control over the educational system (Crespy, 1981). And, in two studies of negotiations in Ohio, the superintendent was the chief negotiator for the majority of school districts or at least served on the negotiating team for the board (OSBA, 1977 and Crewse, 1983). Presise and Himes (2002) mention the problem that can exist when the superintendent represents the board in negotiations and still tries to develop school initiatives with the teaching staff. The board may feel that the superintendent is too closely aligned with the teachers, while the teachers feel that the superintendent is too tied to the board of education. Lunenburg (2000) reminds us that the size of the school district may make a difference, with superintendents negotiating personally in smaller districts. In larger districts, he contends that the chief spokesman is often a director of personnel, assistant superintendent, or the district employs an outside person to do the negotiating. Kerchner (1991)

studied districts undergoing school and union restructuring and found that superintendents in those districts often had to engage in new labor relations roles with the teachers.

Finally, there is an interesting, and like some of the other quotes, somewhat dated, observation concerning the role of the superintendent: "The NEA reduces the superintendent to the go-between; the AASA sees the superintendent in a "dual" role; the NSBA [National School Boards Association] views him as a "channel or interpreter." None of these roles are dynamic and they will result in destroying the effectiveness of the superintendent with his own staff, with the community, and ultimately with the school board" (Shils, 1968).

Whether the superintendent is involved in negotiations or not, the board must still decide who else is part of its negotiating team. In an Ohio doctoral dissertation (Crewse, 1983), the following were listed as serving on negotiating teams (in order of frequency---highest first): superintendents, building level administrators, central office staff, board members, and board attorneys.

One debate has been the use of outside negotiators. Some writers have opposed this concept (Sommers, 1985 and White, 1984) because it is costly and the negotiator's allegiance is not to the district. An Ohio study of 300 superintendents asked opinions of place-bound and career-bound superintendents. Both groups opposed using an outside negotiator. The career-bound negotiators did not want to be involved in negotiations themselves either (Hofmann & Granger, 1991).

Another debate concerning the composition of the negotiations team is the use of school principals. Some have stated that principals usually are not part of the team and are not even consulted (Epstein, 1965), and even go so far to state that the principal should be the chief spokesperson

because “he is more secure and knowledgeable” about the teachers than anyone else (Andree, 1970).

Finally, it has been stated that neither the board nor professional negotiators should be at the table. “Negotiations is the responsibility of the administrative team...” (Whitmer, 1970). School board members should not sit at the bargaining table (Andree, 1971).

Since the board itself must determine who is on its negotiating team, it must, of course, decide whether its own members will be on the team. Several authors have stated reasons why board members should or should not be on their own negotiation teams (Ashby, 1972; Wildman, 1964; Leiberman, 1979; and Ross & MacNaughton, 1982). The advantages and disadvantages mentioned by these writers were used in questions posed in this study.

Method

In 1989, the American Association of School Administrators was asked to independently select a random sample of 400 superintendents from all of the school superintendents in the United States (whether they were members of AASA or not). This number was selected because it exceeds the number required for a sample for this population (of superintendents), according to Krejcie (Newman, 1976).

A questionnaire was sent to those 400 superintendents, asking them questions about collective bargaining and questions for demographic purposes. A stamped, self-addressed return envelope was included with the questionnaire. In 1989, 246 questionnaires were returned, for a return rate of 61.5%.

The questionnaire itself was a collective effort between the university researcher and an administrator in the national AASA office. Additional input into both the

questionnaire and the analysis of the results was obtained from other personnel at The University of Akron.

In 1999, the same questionnaire was used with a few additional questions added concerning the topic of “win-win” bargaining. The questionnaires were sent to the same school districts as in 1989, recognizing that the same superintendents would not be there in many cases. Only 141 superintendents responded with completed questionnaires (35.3% response rate) which could be analyzed. While all the reasons for the lack of response are not known, two reasons were obvious. A number of superintendents sent back questionnaires stating that they worked in states which did not have mandatory collective bargaining and thus did not negotiate formally with their teachers, though they may have met with them to discuss some issues and salary. Another factor was that many questionnaires were returned from the post office with the statement that there was “no such address” or “no such street.” Probably, some school districts consolidated and no longer existed, and some may have moved to new offices, and the post office chose not to forward the mail.

In 2010, the 1999 survey was again sent to the same 400 school districts that were used in the two past studies. There were 106 responses that were usable for a return rate of 26.5%. Although this return rate is lower than in the past, Dr. James Jones, Assistant Director of Research and Design at Ball State University, stated to the author of this article that this return rate was “fairly typical.” He cited a research study at Michigan State University (Kaplowitz, Hadlock, and Levine, 2004) involving over 17,000 surveys by US Mail and by e-mail. The return rate for the e-mail survey was 20.7%, while the rate for the regular mail was 31.5%. Using postcard reminders with e-mail achieved return rates of 29.7% and 28.6%. So, the return rate for this project on collective bargaining, 26.5%, is similar to other return rates. But, it is

still useful to remember the rate when discussing generalization to the population.

The data collection and analysis for the first two surveys took place in the winter and spring months, while the third was completed in the fall of 2010. The data obtained were analyzed on the computer at the university (The University of Akron in 1989; Southern Illinois University at Carbondale in 1999, and Ball State University in 2010), using the SPSS and/or SAS statistical packages. Specifically, the data were subjected to frequency analysis and Pearson correlations. A .05 level of confidence was selected to test for statistical significance.

Results and Discussion

Demographic Results

The results from the 1989, 1999, and 2010 questionnaires are as follows:

Statement	1989	1999	2010
Percentage stating that their school district had ever had a teacher strike	21.2%	24.8%	24.5%
Percentage stating that they had ever been a superintendent during a teacher strike	14.1%	7.8%	6.6%
Total years as a superintendent (range)	1-31	1-31	1-31
Total years as a superintendent (median)	NA	9 yrs.	9.3 yrs.
Typical school organization arrangements (K-12)	85.9%	81.6%	83.0%
Age of the reporting superintendent (51-55)	28.8%	39.7%	22.6%
Gender of the superintendency (male)	91.0%	80.1%	77.4%

(The new "highest range" for 2010 was 56-60 which had 32.1%. And, 20.8% were over 60.)

While some questions elicited similar results (like the total years as a superintendent as a range and median years), some results did change in the ten years between surveys. The number of superintendents who had personally experienced a strike in their careers declined from 14.1% to only 7.8% in 1999 and to 6.6% in 2010. This figure, along with the fairly stable percentage of districts which had had a strike (going from 21.2% to 24.8% to 24.5%) may indicate that fewer districts are now going on strike as compared to the past. Some people who supported mandatory bargaining had hoped that there would be fewer strikes. Their wishes may have come true.

The reporting superintendents are also getting older. In 1989, 28.8% were in the 51-55 range, with the second highest range, 46-50, represented by 24.7%. In 1999, 39.7% were in the 51-55 ranges with 22.7% in a higher range, 56-60. In 2010, there were 22.6% in the 51-55 range, but there were 32.1% aged 56-60, with an additional 20.8% over 60 years of age.

Reflecting the fact that more women are becoming superintendents than in the past, the number of respondents who stated that they were male declined in each of the studies. The number of male superintendents responding to this survey went from 91% to 80.1% to 77.4% in the three studies.

Taking these last two statistics together, we might be able to assume that many of the older superintendents are male and close to retirement, and that some of them are being replaced by female superintendents.

The number of students in the district was similar in both years, though the question was worded in different ways. In 1989, the district size ranged from 57 to 40,000 students, with a median of 1,475. In 1999, the range selected

by the most superintendents, 34.8%, was the 1,001-3,000 range. In 2010, 30.2% chose the 1,001-3,000 student range.

Finally, the superintendents were asked about the path they took to the superintendency. In 1989, 46.8% held a principalship just before becoming superintendents. The exact same percentage (46.8%) agreed in 1999, while in 2010, 53.8% said they had been principals. The second most popular path to the superintendency was through a central office administrative position, with 43.8% having that position in 1989 before becoming superintendent, and 46.1% reporting that position in 1999 and 36.8% in 2010.

Negotiating Team Composition

The superintendents were asked to detail the composition of their school board's negotiating team at the table. Caldwell (1970) asked the same question so that the results can be compared for four different time periods. The results were as follows, stated in percentages responding to each category:

Category	1970	1989	1999	2010
Board attorney (only)	3.0%	2.0%	3.5%	2.8%
Hired negotiator; not board attorney (only)	5.0%	4.0%	3.5%	5.7%
Superintendent (only)	1.0%	6.1%	5.0%	6.6%
Other administrators (only)	1.0%	10.6%	12.1%	6.6%
Committee of some board members (only)	45.0%	11.1%	13.5%	17.9%
The entire school board (only)	9.0%	0.5%	0.7%	0.9%
Combination of the above	37.0%	65.7%	59.6%	56.6%

The majority of school boards use a combination of board members, administrators, and outside professional help rather than have one person (or one category) do the

negotiating. While there was not much change in the use of a professional negotiator (just a slight increase in 2010) or attorney as the sole negotiator, there was an increase in the use of administrators until 2010 when the percentage decreased. Having a committee of board members negotiate also increased in the last three studies, but it is still under 18% as compared to the 1970 study when 45% had this role. These data should not be interpreted to say that board members did not participate in negotiations today. The response to another question stated that 66% of the superintendents said that their board members were on the negotiating team in 2010. Obviously, they were joined by other administrators and, in some cases, professional negotiators to form a team. While the percentage of superintendents negotiating alone at the table increased from the last study, it is still small, 6.6%

Chief Spokesperson

The superintendents were asked to name the chief spokesperson for the school board at the table. The percentages were as follows:

Chief Spokesperson	1989	1999	2010
A board member	27.6%	20.6%	17.0%
The superintendent	17.9%	22.0%	34.0%
A central office administrator	17.3%	16.3%	15.1%
A professional negotiator	21.9%	16.3%	6.6%
The school attorney	15.3%	15.6%	18.9%
A principal	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

If these figures are representative, there seems to be a change from using a board member or a professional negotiator as the chief spokesperson to using the superintendent. Both the board member percentage and the

professional negotiator percentage have decreased in each study with a substantial decrease in the use of the professional negotiator. These negotiators are paid professionals, and in tough economic times, districts may have decided not to spend the money. Also, as superintendents have become more experienced at collective bargaining, they have assumed a larger role as the chief spokesperson at the table. The one constant in the three studies was that no one used a principal as the head of the board's negotiating time. While it is understandable that the board and superintendent may not want the principals to have to engage in what can be a confrontational activity and then return to run a building and work with teachers, it is still somewhat amazing that not one superintendent reported a principal as chief spokesperson in any of the studies.

Superintendent Participation

When superintendents were asked whether they felt they should be on the negotiating team (whether or not they were on it already), these were the responses:

Response	1989	1999	2010
Yes, they felt they should be on the team	47.5%	55.3%	62.3%
No, they felt they should not be on the team	40.5%	36.2%	25.5%
No opinion; or, it could change yearly	11.6%	8.5%	10.4%

While the 1989 results were not conclusive, the results in 1999 seemed to favor the superintendent being a part of the negotiating team. This percentage increased in 2010 so that the percentage of superintendents that felt that they should be on the team increased a great deal from 1989 to 2010: 47.5% to 62.3%.

Superintendent's First and Last Choice

Two other questions dealing with the composition of the board's negotiating team asked superintendents the following: If the board insisted that you serve as the chief spokesperson at the table and you could select only one other person to serve with you, who would you select? And, who would you least like to serve with you at the table?

First Choice	1989	1999	2010
Board member	30.9%	27.0%	23.6%
Central administrator	22.7%	27.7%	35.8%
School attorney	22.7%	18.4%	20.8%
Professional negotiator	17.5%	18.4%	11.3%
Principal	5.7%	5.7%	3.8%
Other administrator	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%

Last Choice	1989	1999	2010
Board member	39.0%	29.1%	35.8%
Principal	27.0%	26.2%	26.4%
School attorney	9.4%	15.6%	7.5%
Professional negotiator	8.8%	9.9%	12.3%
Central administrator	8.8%	4.3%	3.8%
Other administrator	3.8%	5.0%	1.9%

It is interesting to note that "board member" was rated very high as both the first choice and the last choice. Apparently, superintendents have specific members in mind when they both select and reject board members to serve with them at the table.

Principals consistently come in second as the least desirable to accompany the superintendent to the negotiating table. As stated previously, one possible reason for rejecting principals is that some superintendents do not want the

principals to jeopardize their relationship with their teachers. Board members and central office administrators are further removed from the building faculty and less likely to have the type of relationships with teachers that principals have.

While there are minor differences between the 1989, 1999, and 2010 figures, the results are quite similar: Superintendents would prefer to have a specific board member or a central administrator with them at the negotiating table, and they would prefer not to have a specific board member or a principal at the table. There does seem to be a trend toward not selecting a board member to serve with the superintendent at the table. Also, the professional negotiator is less likely to be chosen to help than in the past as noted by the fact that the “first choice” percentage has declined, and the “last choice” has increased.

Advantages and Disadvantages of Board Members at the Table

Research has indicated that certain factors are advantages for having board members serve on the board’s negotiating team (Ashby, 1972; Wildman, 1964; Lieberman, 1979; and Ross, 1982). The superintendents were asked to what extent they agreed that these were advantages (expressed in percentage of superintendents who said they “agree” or “strongly agree” on a five point scale).

Advantages	1989	1999	2010
Having a board member on the team...			
allows the board member to hear teacher demands and feelings directly	85.4%	73.7%	61.3%
provides direct communications to other board members	76.3%	73.1%	62.2%
increases the credibility of the	69.2%	62.4%	77.3%

negotiating team to have a board member on the team			
---	--	--	--

Overall, the percentages obtained in 1999 were less than those of 1989, and this pattern continued in 2010 for the first two statements. This may reflect superintendents' opinions that there are fewer advantages to having board members on the team than there have been in the past. In some conflicting data, superintendents were less likely to select a board member to serve with them in collective bargaining (the last section on "First Choice"), but 77.3% said that having a board member on the team did increase the credibility of the team. This was an increase over the past percentages.

Similarly, there are factors, mentioned in the literature by the same authors, which are stated as disadvantages for having a board member on the board's negotiating team. The superintendents were asked whether they agreed that these factors were disadvantages. (Again, the percentages listed are the sum of "agree" and "strongly agree" as expressed by the responding superintendents.)

Disadvantages	1989	1999	2010
It is a disadvantage to have a board member on the team because...			
it is very time consuming and may be hard to schedule meetings with board member on the team	67.2%	63.1%	64.1%
it could hurt the board member's relationship with the teachers	61.1%	50.4%	49.0%
-board member may lack expertise in negotiations	83.9%	71.6%	79.2%
the process might pit this board member against other board members not on the team	41.9%	39.7%	35.9%
it could weaken the other team	41.9%	38.3%	40.6%

members in the eyes of the teachers			
having the board member on the team causes the board member to engage in an administrative function	51.5%	48.3%	60.4%

The largest changes were increases in “board member may lack expertise in negotiations” and “having the board member on the team causes the board member to engage in an administrative function.” The fact that superintendents tend not to want to choose board members for the team is probably based on these two disadvantages. If board members lack expertise, and if the superintendent feels that board members are infringing on an administrative function, it makes sense that fewer superintendents want them on the negotiations team.

Superintendent's Role

Another question was asked in this questionnaire because it was also contained in a 1970 survey of superintendents (Caldwell, 1970). Superintendents were asked to pick the one most dominant role they had had in negotiations.

Superintendent's Role	1970	1989	1999	2010
Non-participant in negotiations	0.4%	5.6%	4.3%	8.5%
Advisor to teachers' organizations only	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Advisor to both teachers' organization and to the board of education	43.4%	16.6%	16.3%	9.4%
Advisor to the board only	19.1%	46.0%	37.6%	27.4%

Negotiator for the board with limited authority	31.5%	15.1%	19.1%	20.8%
Negotiator for the board with full authority	5.6%	16.7%	21.3%	32.1%

It should not be surprising that superintendents no longer “serve two masters,” advising both teachers’ organizations and their boards. Also, as negotiations have become more complicated, more superintendents have been given full authority to negotiate for their boards. An interesting statistic is that more superintendents are non-participants than in the past, possibly because negotiations have become more militant.

Situations Experienced in Negotiations

Another question asked the superintendents to what extent certain statements made by authors of negotiations textbooks and other articles on negotiations actually occurred during the negotiations process. (The percentages listed indicate the superintendents’ opinions that the statement made does occur “frequently” or “often,” added together, on a five point scale.)

Statement

	1989	1999	2010
Teachers' organizations have tried to dictate or influence who would be on the board's team or how many members the board's team should have	19.3%	17.0%	18.0%
If a board member serves on the negotiating team, the teachers expect that member to automatically ratify the contract when the board member votes	76.1%	59.6%	47.2%
Teacher organizations have tried to cause conflict between the negotiator and the board in order to see to what extent the board supported the negotiator	40.7%	32.7%	23.6%
When some board members negotiate, it places a strain on the relationship between them and the non-negotiating board members	28.5%	26.9%	25.5%
Teacher organizations have tried to bypass the board's negotiating team and go directly to the board to give them information or to get them to negotiate directly with them	39.5%	36.9%	28.3%
Sometimes a board member will vote against ratification for personal or political reasons and still hope that the rest of board ratifies the contract	22.8%	26.2%	17.9%

One pattern that occurs in most of these numbers is that these "negative" statements have a declining percentage from 1989 to 1999 to 2010. Perhaps, negotiations have become more sophisticated with time so that participants play fewer "games" with each other than in the past.

Correlation Studies

District Size

Pearson correlation coefficients were used to examine to what extent, if any, the variables correlated with the size of the district. Below are the results for 1989, followed by the results for 1999. Correlations were also run in 2010, but, with fewer responses, there were not as many significant findings. As a result, they are not listed for 2010.

Table 1

Comparison of Factors With District Size, 1989

Factor	Pearson r	Probability	Sig.
Comparison Between District Size (Students) and:whether the district had ever had a strike	0.05702	0.4261	NS
years of service as a superintendent	0.03160	0.6593	NS
whether the superintendent served on the neg. team	-0.28494	0.0001	S
having a board member negotiate increased the credibility of the team	-0.32590	0.0001	S
having a board member negotiate provided direct communication to other board members	-0.28673	0.0001	S
having a board member negotiate allowed the board member to hear teacher demands directly	-0.23005	0.0013	S
having a board member negotiate was very timeconsuming and was hard to schedule	0.21458	0.0027	S
having a board member negotiate hurt his/her relationship with teachers	0.21704	0.0024	S
having board members negotiate was a disadvantage because they lack expertise	0.11790	0.1016	NS
having a board member negotiate pit this board member against other	0.30457	0.0001	S

board members			
having a board member negotiate weakened other team members in the eyes of the teachers	0.25107	0.0004	S
having a board member negotiate caused the board member to engage in an administrative function	0.26538	0.0002	S
when a board member negotiated, it placed a strain between them and the non-negotiating board members	0.28469	0.0001	S
teacher organizations tried to bypass the board's team and go directly to the board	0.17860	0.0132	S
whether the superintendent had ever been in a strike	0.14676	0.0396	S
the age of the superintendent	0.17414	0.0144	S

Note. A “yes” response was rated as “1”; a “no” as “0”.

Table 2
Comparison of Factors With District Size, 1999

Factors	Pearson r Probability		Sig
Comparison Between District Size (Students) and: (only factors which were significant are listed for 1999) having a board member negotiate caused the board member to engage in an administrative function	0.1711	0.044	S
the age of the superintendent	-0.1727	0.043	S

The following two sections will show only significant relationships and will show both 1989 and 1999 data in the same tables.

Teacher Strikes

Table 3

Comparison of Factors with Teacher Strikes, 1989 and 1999

Factor	Pearson r	Probability	Sig.
Comparison Between Whether District Had Ever Had a Strike and Having a school attorney on the negotiating team			
1989	0.15089	0.0348	S
1999	0.1921	0.036	S

Superintendent Experience

Table 4

Comparison of Factors With Superintendent Experience, 1989 and 1999

Factor	Pearson r	Probability	Sig.
Comparison of Total Years as a Superintendent and: Whether the superintendent feels that he/she should be on the negotiating team			
1989	-0.16987	0.0176	S
1999	-0.1673	0.047	S

The following can be stated from the four correlation tables:

Looking at the 1989 study in particular, there was no significant linear relationship between the size of the school district and whether it had had a strike. Thus, larger districts did not necessarily have more strikes than small ones.

There was a significant curvilinear relationship only when the size of the district was over 15,000 (1989 study), the maximum likelihood of a strike. (More precisely, the

maximum point at which strikes occurred was in districts of 15,725).

There was a significant relationship between districts having strikes and the teachers' organization bypassing the board's negotiating team and going directly to the board. And, as the districts increased in size, the greater was the extent that the teacher organizations bypassed the negotiating teams. An implication may be that the boards, especially in large districts, should try to avoid letting the teacher organizations bypass their team and go directly to the full board.

There was no significant relationship between district strikes and having board members who lacked negotiating expertise serve on the negotiating team. And, there was no significant relationship between strikes and having had a board member on the negotiating team in order to hear teacher demands directly. (This should not be confused with "teachers by passing the negotiating team.")

This goes somewhat counter to conventional thinking: One would think that having a board member with no expertise on the negotiating team would be related to strikes. It was not. Also, if board members on the negotiating team had a hard time scheduling negotiation sessions, this might be related to strikes. It was not. And, it is interesting that strikes were not related to board members on the negotiating teams hearing teacher demands and feelings directly. However, strikes are related to teacher organizations bypassing the negotiating team in order to go directly to the full board of education.

The negative correlations in Table 4 for both 1989 and 1999 mean that as the superintendents gain more years of experience, they tend to feel less inclined to be a part of the negotiating team. It may be the case that superintendents delegated this responsibility for negotiating contracts as they

gained experience or learned that security was better protected by avoiding negotiations.

The only significant factor related to whether a district has ever had a teacher strike in both the 1989 and 1999 studies was having a school attorney present on the negotiating team. Sometimes, an attorney may cause problems which causes the teachers' organization to become upset, resulting in a strike. On the other hand, the attorney may be on the team because the board feels that there is a good chance that the teachers will go on strike, and they wanted the legal expertise of the attorney on the team.

Win-Win Bargaining

Several questions were added to the 1999 survey (also used in 2010) which were not on the 1989 questionnaire. These concerned a type of negotiations that is often called "win-win" bargaining. Though the concept has different names and may be implemented in different ways, the basic idea is that both sides will sit down together to discuss their questions, concerns, and problems, organize into committees with representatives from both sides (teachers and the board/administration), and spend a limited amount of time, perhaps two to three weeks, working on solutions. Then, the committees report back to the full group, and they try to work out solutions that will be "winners" for both sides, rather than engage in traditional adversarial bargaining. Some superintendents responding to the 2010 study mentioned that they now call this type of bargaining "interest-based bargaining" or "collaborative bargaining" in their states.

When asked if they had ever had any experience with win-win bargaining (or perhaps by a different name), 75.2% of the responding superintendents stated that they had participated in this type of bargaining in 1999, with 67.9% reporting such participation in the 2010 study. Since this

concept is newer than traditional bargaining, this high response rate was somewhat surprising. Of course, this does not mean that these superintendents use this type of bargaining all the time. It does mean that they had used it at one time or another in their careers, perhaps, at times, to try some new way to complete negotiations in a more positive way.

Additional questions were asked of those superintendents who **had** participated in a type of win-win bargaining in the 2010 survey. When asked if they felt that win-win was preferable to traditional adversarial bargaining, 82.5% of those who had participated in this bargaining stated that it was a better way to negotiate.

One of the desired outcomes of win-win bargaining is a more positive and cooperative attitude between the teachers and the board and administration. When the superintendents who had used win-win bargaining were asked if this was accomplished (whether the outcome was more positive than in traditional bargaining), 82.9% responded that the resulting attitude was more positive.

One criticism of win-win bargaining is that school districts often have to give up more money in this type of bargaining to maintain the positive attitude. The superintendents did not agree. Of those responding, 72.5% said that they did not feel that their boards gave away more money and/or language in the contract in order to have a successful win-win session, as compared to traditional bargaining.

Finally, the superintendents were asked if they would recommend win-win bargaining. As might be expected from the other results, 87.0% stated that they would recommend it, with 13.0% not recommending win-win over traditional bargaining.

References

- American Association of School Administrators. (1961). *School administrators view professional negotiation*. Washington, DC: Author.
- American Association of School Administrators. (1968). *The school administrator and negotiation*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Andree, R.G. (1970). *Collective negotiations*. Lexington, MA: Heath Lexington Books.
- Andree, R. G. (1971). *The art of negotiation*. Lexington, MA: Heath Lexington Books.
- Ashby, L.W., McGinnis, J.E., and Persing, T.E. (1972). *Common sense in negotiations in public education*. Danville, IL: Interstate Printers.
- Caldwell, W.E. (1970). The superintendent's negotiation role. *The Journal of Educational Research*. 64 (2). 73-77.
- Campbell, R.F., Cunningham, L.L., & McPhee, R.F. (1965). The organization and control of American schools. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.
- Cresby, V., & Morgan, J.A. (1981, May). Should your superintendent negotiate? American School Board Journal, pp. 27-29.
- Crewse, F. (1983). The relationship of teacher and school board of education negotiation team composition, bargaining styles, and size of district with aspects of collective bargaining in selected public school districts in Ohio. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Akron.

- Epstein, B. (1965). The principal's role in collective negotiations between teachers and school Boards. Washington, DC: National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- Ficklen, E. (1985, May). Whoa, there! By stationing the superintendent at the bargaining table, you could be gunning for trouble. American School Board Journal, pp. 32-33.
- Gaswirth, M. (1986, April). School boards must hear superintendent's advice. American School and University, pp. 72-25.
- Getzels, J.J., Lipham, J.M., & Campbell, R.F. (1968). Educational administration as a social process. New York: Harper and Row.
- Hofmann, R. & Granger, J. (Oct., 1991). Career-bound and place-bound superintendents' attitudes toward collective bargaining. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwestern Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL, October 16-19, 1991.
- Kaplowitz, M.D., Hadlock, T. D., & Levine, R. (2004). A comparison of web and mail survey response rates. Public Opinion Quarterly, 68 (1), 94-101.
- Kerchner, C. T. (April 1991). Superintendent role changes and labor relations reform. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL, April 3-7, 1991.
- Lieberman, M. (1979). Before, during, and after bargaining. Chicago: Teach 'em.
- Lunenburg, F.C. (June, 2000). Collective bargaining in the public schools: Issues, tactics, and new strategies. Opinion paper. Document ED 452 587 EA 030 960
- National Education Association. (1963). Guidelines for professional negotiations. Washington, DC: Author.

- Newman, I. (1976). Basic procedures in conducting survey research. Akron, OH: The University of Akron.
- Ohio School Boards Association. (1977). Negotiations benchmark: Where we are today. Columbus, OH: Author.
- Prosise, R. & Himes, L. (June, 2002). The collective bargaining tightrope. The School Administrator. v. 59 n. 6, 18-22.
- Ross, V.J., & MacNaughton, R. (1982, March). Memorize these bargaining rules before you tackle negotiations. American School Board Journal, pp. 29-35.
- Sharp, W.L. (Dec., 2002). The role of the superintendent and school board in collective bargaining: 1989-1999. Educational Research Quarterly. 26 (2), 39-53.
- Shils, E.B., & Whittier, C.T. (1968). Teachers, administrators, and collective bargaining. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.
- Sommers, N.L. (1985, May). Is it time to dump your hired gun? American School Board Journal, pp.29-35.
- Stinnett, T.M., Kleinmann, J.H., & Ware, M.L. (1966). Professional negotiation in public education. New York: Macmillan.
- White, P. (1964, January). Who bargains for the board? Thrust, pp. 22-23.
- Whitner, D.P. (1970). [A brochure used in his campaign for national office in the American Association of School Administrators].
- Wildman, W.H. (1964, December). Implications of teacher bargaining for school administrators. Phi Delta Kappan, pp. 152-158.